

Interview Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)
	10/038,062		MILKS, STEPHEN A.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael K. GRAY	3746	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Michael K. GRAY. (3) _____
 (2) W.R. Duke Taylor, Esq. (4) _____

Date of Interview: July 15, 2003.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 1-10

Identification of prior art discussed: Hung, Raab, Shibuya et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: _____

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Discussed adding language to claim 1 to indicate that device is sealed so as to allow cleaning of fan blades. Attorney pointed out that Raab reference (regarding claim 10) teaches supports that are only in one of two positions - with no intermediate positions.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Michael K. Gray
 Examiner's signature, if required